arXiv:1606.03794v1 [math.AP] 13 Jun 2016

WEIGHTED NORM INEQUALITIES OF $(1,q)$-TYPE FOR INTEGRAL AND FRACTIONAL MAXIMAL OPERATORS

STEPHEN QUINN AND IGOR E. VERBITSKY

Dedicated to Richard L. Wheeden

ABSTRACT. We study weighted norm inequalities of $(1,q)$- type for $0<q<1$,

$$\|\mathbf{G}\nu\|_{L^q(\Omega,d\sigma)} \le C\,\|\nu\|, \quad \text{for all positive measures } \nu \text{ in } \Omega,$$

along with their weak-type counterparts, where $\|\nu\| = \nu(\Omega)$, and G is an integral operator with nonnegative kernel,

$$\mathbf{G}\nu(x) = \int_\Omega G(x,y)\,d\nu(y).$$

These problems are motivated by sublinear elliptic equations in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with non-trivial Green's function $G(x,y)$ associated with the Laplacian, fractional Laplacian, or more general elliptic operator.

We also treat fractional maximal operators M_α $(0 \le \alpha < n)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and characterize strong- and weak-type $(1,q)$-inequalities for M_α and more general maximal operators, as well as $(1,q)$-Carleson measure inequalities for Poisson integrals.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we discuss recent results on weighted norm inequalities of $(1,q)$-type in the case $0<q<1$,

$$\|\mathbf{G}\nu\|_{L^q(\Omega,d\sigma)} \le C\,\|\nu\|, \tag{1.1}$$

for all positive measures ν in Ω, where $\|\nu\| = \nu(\Omega)$, and $\mathbf{G}$ is an integral operator with nonnegative kernel,

$$\mathbf{G}\nu(x) = \int_\Omega G(x,y)\,d\nu(y).$$

Such problems are motivated by sublinear elliptic equations of the type

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \sigma u^q \ \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

in the case $0<q<1$, where Ω is an open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with non-trivial Green's function $G(x,y)$, and $\sigma \ge 0$ is an arbitrary locally integrable function, or locally finite measure in Ω.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35J61, 42B37; Secondary 31B15, 42B25.

Key words and phrases. Weighted norm inequalities, sublinear elliptic equations, Green's functions, weak maximum principle, fractional maximal operators, Carleson measures.

The only restrictions imposed on the kernel G are that it is quasi-symmetric and satisfies a weak maximum principle. In particular, $\mathbf{G}$ can be a Green operator associated with the Laplacian, a more general elliptic operator (including the fractional Laplacian), or a convolution operator on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with radially symmetric decreasing kernel $G(x,y) = k(|x-y|)$ (see [1], [12]).

In particular, we consider in detail the one-dimensional case where $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+$ and $G(x,y) = \min(x,y)$. We deduce explicit characterizations of the corresponding $(1,q)$-weighted norm inequalities, give explicit necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of weak solutions, and obtain sharp two-sided pointwise estimates of solutions.

We also characterize weak-type counterparts of (1.1), namely,

$$\|\mathbf{G}\nu\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\Omega,d\sigma)} \le C\,\|\nu\|. \tag{1.2}$$

Along with integral operators, we treat fractional maximal operators M_α with $0 \le \alpha < n$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and characterize both strong- and weak-type $(1,q)$-inequalities for M_α, and more general maximal operators. Similar problems for Riesz potentials were studied earlier in [6]–[8]. Finally, we apply our results for the integral operators to the Poisson kernel to characterize a $(1,q)$-Carleson measure inequality.

2. Integral Operators

2.1. **Strong-Type $(1,q)$-Inequality for Integral Operators.** Let $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a connected open set. By $\mathscr{M}^+(\Omega)$ we denote the class of all nonnegative locally finite Borel measures in Ω. Let $G\colon \Omega\times\Omega \to [0,+\infty]$ be a nonnegative lower-semicontinuous kernel. We will assume throughout this paper that G is quasi-symmetric, i.e., there exists a constant $a > 0$ such that

$$a^{-1}G(x,y) \le G(y,x) \le a\,G(x,y), \quad x,y \in \Omega. \tag{2.1}$$

If $\nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\Omega)$, then by $\mathbf{G}\nu$ and $\mathbf{G}^*\nu$ we denote the integral operators (potentials) defined respectively by

$$\mathbf{G}\nu(x) = \int_\Omega G(x,y)\,d\nu(y), \quad \mathbf{G}^*\nu(x) = \int_\Omega G(y,x)\,d\nu(y), \quad x \in \Omega. \tag{2.2}$$

We say that the kernel G satisfies the *weak maximum principle* if, for any constant $M > 0$, the inequality

$$\mathbf{G}\nu(x) \le M \quad \text{for all } x \in S(\nu)$$

implies

$$\mathbf{G}\nu(x) \le hM \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega,$$

where $h \ge 1$ is a constant, and $S(\nu) := \operatorname{supp}\nu$. When $h = 1$, we say that $\mathbf{G}\nu$ satisfies the *strong maximum principle*.

It is well-known that Green's kernels associated with many partial differential operators are quasi-symmetric, and satisfy the weak maximum principle (see, e.g., [2], [3], [12]).

The kernel G is said to be *degenerate* with respect to $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\Omega)$ provided there exists a set $A \subset \Omega$ with $\sigma(A) > 0$ and

$$G(\cdot, y) = 0 \quad d\sigma\text{-a.e. for } y \in A.$$

Otherwise, we will say that G is *non-degenerate* with respect to σ. (This notion was introduced in [19] in the context of (p,q)-inequalities for positive operators $T: L^p \to L^q$ in the case $1 < q < p$.)

Let $0 < q < 1$, and let G be a kernel on $\Omega \times \Omega$. For $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\Omega)$, we consider the problem of the existence of a *positive solution* u to the integral equation

$$u = \mathbf{G}(u^q d\sigma) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad 0 < u < +\infty \ d\sigma\text{-a.e.}, \quad u \in L^q_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega). \tag{2.3}$$

We call u a positive *supersolution* if

$$u \geq \mathbf{G}(u^q d\sigma) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad 0 < u < +\infty \ d\sigma\text{-a.e.}, \quad u \in L^q_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega). \tag{2.4}$$

This is a generalization of the sublinear elliptic problem (see, e.g., [4], [5], and the literature cited there):

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \sigma u^q & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

where σ is a nonnegative locally integrable function, or measure, in Ω.

If Ω is a bounded C^2-domain then solutions to (2.5) can be understood in the "very weak" sense (see, e.g., [13]). For general domains Ω with a nontrivial Green function G associated with the Dirichlet Laplacian Δ in Ω, solutions u are understood as in (2.3).

Remark 2.1. *In this paper, for the sake of simplicity, we sometimes consider positive solutions and supersolutions $u \in L^q(\Omega, d\sigma)$. In other words, we replace the natural local condition $u \in L^q_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega, d\sigma)$ with its global counterpart. Notice that the local condition is necessary for solutions (or supersolutions) to be properly defined.*

To pass from solutions u which are globally in $L^q(\Omega, d\sigma)$ to all solutions $u \in L^q_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega, d\sigma)$ (for instance, very weak solutions to (2.5)), one can use either a localization method developed in [7] (in the case of Riesz kernels on $\mathbb{R}^n$), or *modified* kernels $\widetilde{G}(x,y) = \frac{G(x,y)}{m(x)\,m(y)}$, where the modifier $m(x) = \min\Big(1, G(x,x_0)\Big)$ (with a fixed pole $x_0 \in \Omega$) plays the role of a regularized distance to the boundary $\partial\Omega$. One also needs to consider the corresponding $(1,q)$-inequalities with a weight m (see [16]). See the next section in the one-dimensional case where $\Omega = (0, +\infty)$.

Remark 2.2. *Finite energy solutions, for instance, solutions $u \in W^{1,2}_0(\Omega)$ to* (2.5)*, require the global condition $u \in L^{1+q}(\Omega, d\sigma)$, and are easier to characterize (see* [6], [16]*).*

The following theorem is proved in [16]. (The case where $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{G} = (-\Delta)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is the Riesz potential of order $\alpha \in (0,n)$ was considered earlier in [7].)

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\Omega)$, and $0 < q < 1$. Suppose G is a quasi-symmetric kernel which satisfies the weak maximum principle. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *There exists a positive constant $\varkappa = \varkappa(\sigma)$ such that*

$$\|\mathbf{G}\nu\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \le \varkappa \|\nu\| \quad \text{for all } \nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\Omega).$$

(2) *There exists a positive supersolution $u \in L^q(\Omega, d\sigma)$ to* (2.4)*.*

(3) *There exists a positive solution $u \in L^q(\Omega, d\sigma)$ to* (2.3)*, provided additionally that G is non-degenerate with respect to σ.*

Remark 2.4. *The implication* (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) *in Theorem 2.3 holds for any nonnegative kernel G, without assuming that it is either quasi-symmetric, or satisfies the weak maximum principle. This is a consequence of Gagliardo's lemma* [10]*; see details in* [16].

Remark 2.5. *The implication* (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) *generally fails for kernels G which do not satisfy the weak maximum principle (see examples in* [16]*).*

The following corollary of Theorem 2.3 is obtained in [16].

Corollary 2.6. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.3, if there exists a positive supersolution $u \in L^q(\Omega, \sigma)$ to* (2.4)*, then $\mathbf{G}\sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{1-q}}(\Omega, d\sigma)$.*

Conversely, if $\mathbf{G}\sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{1-q},1}(\Omega, d\sigma)$, then there exists a non-trivial supersolution $u \in L^q(\Omega, \sigma)$ to (2.4) *(respectively, a solution u, provided G is non-degenerate with respect to σ).*

2.2. **The One-Dimensional Case.** In this section, we consider positive weak solutions to sublinear ODEs of the type (2.5) on the semi-axis $\mathbb{R}_+ = (0, +\infty)$. It is instructive to consider the one-dimensional case where elementary characterizations of $(1,q)$-weighed norm inequalities, along with the corresponding existence theorems and explicit global pointwise estimates of solutions are available. Similar results hold for sublinear equations on any interval $(a,b) \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Let $0 < q < 1$, and let $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Suppose u is a positive weak solution to the equation

$$-u'' = \sigma u^q \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+, \quad u(0) = 0, \tag{2.6}$$

such that $\lim_{x\to+\infty} \frac{u(x)}{x} = 0$. This condition at infinity ensures that u does not contain a linear component. Notice that we assume that u is concave and increasing on $[0, +\infty)$, and $\lim_{x\to 0^+} u(x) = 0$.

In terms of integral equations, we have $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+$, and $G(x,y) = \min(x,y)$ is the Green function associated with the Sturm-Liouville operator $\Delta u = u''$ with zero boundary condition at $x = 0$. Thus, (2.6) is equivalent to the equation

$$u(x) = \mathbf{G}(u^q d\sigma)(x) := \int_0^{+\infty} \min(x,y) u(y)^q d\sigma(y), \quad x > 0, \tag{2.7}$$

where σ is a locally finite measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$, and

$$\int_0^a y\, u(y)^q d\sigma(y) < +\infty, \quad \int_a^{+\infty} u(y)^q d\sigma(y) < +\infty, \quad \text{for every } a > 0. \tag{2.8}$$

This "local integrability" condition ensures that the right-hand side of (2.7) is well defined. Here intervals $(a,+\infty)$ are used in place of balls $B(x,r)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Notice that

$$u'(x)=\int_x^{+\infty} u(y)^q d\sigma(y), \quad x>0. \tag{2.9}$$

Hence, u satisfies the global integrability condition

$$\int_0^{+\infty} u(y)^q d\sigma(y)<+\infty \tag{2.10}$$

if and only if $u'(0)<+\infty$.

The corresponding $(1,q)$-weighted norm inequality is given by

$$\|\mathbf{G}v\|_{L^q(\sigma)}\le \varkappa\|v\|, \tag{2.11}$$

where $\varkappa=\varkappa(\sigma)$ is a positive constant which does not depend on $v\in\mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Obviously, (2.11) is equivalent to

$$\|H_+v+H_-v\|_{L^q(\sigma)}\le \varkappa\|v\| \quad \text{for all } v\in\mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+), \tag{2.12}$$

where $H_\pm$ is a pair of Hardy operators,

$$H_+v(x)=\int_0^x y\,dv(y), \quad H_-v(x)=x\int_x^{+\infty} dv(y).$$

The following proposition can be deduced from the known results on two-weight Hardy inequalities in the case $p=1$ and $0<q<1$ (see, e.g., [20]). We give here a simple independent proof.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\sigma\in\mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+)$, and let $0<q<1$. Then* (2.11) *holds if and only if*

$$\varkappa(\sigma)^q=\int_0^{+\infty} x^q d\sigma(x)<+\infty, \tag{2.13}$$

where $\varkappa(\sigma)$ is the best constant in (2.11).

Proof. Clearly,

$$H_+v(x)+H_-v(x)\le x\|v\|, \quad x>0.$$

Hence,

$$\|H_+v+H_-v\|_{L^q(\sigma)}\le \Big(\int_0^{+\infty} x^q d\sigma(x)\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}}\|v\|,$$

which proves (2.12), and hence (2.11), with $\varkappa=\Big(\int_0^{+\infty} x^q d\sigma(x)\Big)^{\frac{1}{q}}$.

Conversely, suppose that (2.12) holds. Then, for every $a>0$, and $v\in\mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\int_0^a x^q d\sigma(x)\Big)\Big(\int_a^{+\infty} dv(y)\Big)^q\\
&\le \int_0^a \Big(x\int_x^{+\infty} dv(y)\Big)^q d\sigma(x)\\
&\le \int_0^{+\infty} (H_-v)^q d\sigma\le \varkappa^q\|v\|^q.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\nu = \delta_{x_0}$ with $x_0 > a$, we get

$$\int_0^a x^q d\sigma(x) \le \varkappa^q.$$

Letting $a \to +\infty$, we deduce (2.13). □

Clearly, the Green kernel $G(x,y) = \min(x,y)$ is symmetric, and satisfies the strong maximum principle. Hence, by Theorem 2.3, equations (2.6) and (2.7) have a non-trivial (super)solution $u \in L^q(\mathbb{R}_+, \sigma)$ if and only if (2.13) holds.

From Proposition 2.7, we deduce that, for "localized" measures $d\sigma_a = \chi_{(a,+\infty)} d\sigma$ ($a > 0$), we have

$$\varkappa(\sigma_a) = \Big(\int_a^{+\infty} x^q d\sigma(x) \Big)^{\frac{1}{q}}. \tag{2.14}$$

Using this observation and the localization method developed in [7], we obtain the following existence theorem for general weak solutions to (2.5), along with sharp pointwise estimates of solutions.

We introduce a new potential

$$\mathbf{K}\sigma(x) := x \Big(\int_x^{+\infty} y^q d\sigma(y) \Big)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}, \quad x > 0. \tag{2.15}$$

We observe that $\mathbf{K}\sigma$ is a one-dimensional analogue of the potential introduced recently in [7] in the framework of intrinsic Wolff potentials in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (see also [8] in the radial case). Matching upper and lower pointwise bounds of solutions are obtained below by combining $\mathbf{G}\sigma$ with $\mathbf{K}\sigma$.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}_+)$, and let $0 < q < 1$. Then equation* (2.5)*, or equivalently* (2.6) *has a nontrivial solution if and only if, for every $a > 0$,*

$$\int_0^a x\, d\sigma(x) + \int_a^{+\infty} x^q d\sigma(x) < +\infty. \tag{2.16}$$

Moreover, if (2.16) *holds, then there exists a positive solution u to* (2.5) *such that*

$$C^{-1} \Big[\Big(\int_0^x y\, d\sigma(y) \Big)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} + \mathbf{K}\sigma(x) \Big] \tag{2.17}$$

$$\le u(x) \le C \Big[\Big(\int_0^x y\, d\sigma(y) \Big)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} + \mathbf{K}\sigma(x) \Big]. \tag{2.18}$$

The lower bound in (2.17) *holds for any non-trivial supersolution u.*

Remark 2.9. *The lower bound*

$$u(x) \ge (1-q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \Big[\mathbf{G}\sigma(x) \Big]^{\frac{1}{1-q}}, \quad x > 0, \tag{2.19}$$

is known for a general kernel G which satisfies the strong maximum principle (see [11]*, Theorem 3.3;* [16]*), and the constant $(1-q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$ here is sharp. However, the second term on the left-hand side of* (2.17) *makes the lower estimate stronger, so that it matches the upper estimate.*

Proof. The lower bound

$$u(x) \geq (1-q)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} \Big[\int_0^x y\, d\sigma(y) \Big]^{\frac{1}{1-q}}, \quad x > 0, \tag{2.20}$$

is immediate from (2.19).

Applying Lemma 4.2 in [7], with the interval $(a,+\infty)$ in place of a ball B, and combining it with (2.14), for any $a > 0$ we have

$$\int_a^{+\infty} u(y)^q d\sigma(y) \geq c(q) \varkappa(\sigma_a)^{\frac{q}{1-q}} = c(q) \Big[\int_a^{+\infty} y^q d\sigma(y) \Big]^{\frac{1}{1-q}}.$$

Hence,

$$u(x) \geq \mathbf{G}(u^q d\sigma) \geq x \int_x^{+\infty} u(y)^q d\sigma(y) \geq c(q)\, x \Big[\int_x^{+\infty} y^q d\sigma(y) \Big]^{\frac{1}{1-q}}.$$

Combining the preceding estimate with (2.20), we obtain the lower bound in (2.17) for any non-trivial supersolution u. This also proves that (2.16) is necessary for the existence of a non-trivial positive supersolution.

Conversely, suppose that (2.16) holds. Let

$$v(x) := c \Big[\Big(\int_0^x y\, d\sigma(y) \Big)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} + \mathbf{K}\sigma(x) \Big], \quad x > 0, \tag{2.21}$$

where c is a positive constant. It is not difficult to see that v is a supersolution, so that $v \geq \mathbf{G}(v^q d\sigma)$, if $c = c(q)$ is picked large enough. (See a similar argument in the proof of Theorem 5.1 in [8].)

Also, it is easy to see that $v_0 = c_0 (\mathbf{G}\sigma)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$ is a subsolution, i.e., $v_0 \leq \mathbf{G}(v_0^q d\sigma)$, provided $c_0 > 0$ is a small enough constant. Moreover, we can ensure that $v_0 \leq v$ if $c_0 = c_0(q)$ is picked sufficiently small. (See details in [8] in the case of radially symmetric solutions in $\mathbb{R}^n$.) Hence, there exists a solution which can be constructed by iterations, starting from $u_0 = v_0$, and letting

$$u_{j+1} = \mathbf{G}(u_j^q d\sigma), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots.$$

Then by induction $u_j \leq u_{j+1} \leq v$, and consequently $u = \lim_{j \to +\infty} u_j$ is a solution to (2.7) by the Monotone Convergence Theorem. Clearly, $u \leq v$, which proves the upper bound in (2.17). □

2.3. **Weak-Type $(1,q)$-Inequality for Integral Operators.** In this section, we characterize weak-type analogues of $(1,q)$-weighted norm inequalities considered above. We will use some elements of potential theory for general positive kernels G, including the notion of *inner capacity*, $\mathrm{cap}(\cdot)$, and the associated *equilibrium* (extremal) measure (see [9]).

Theorem 2.10. *Let $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $0 < q < 1$, and $0 \leq \alpha < n$. Suppose G satisfies the weak maximum principle. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(1) *There exists a positive constant $\varkappa_w$ such that*

$$\|\mathbf{G}\nu\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \leq \varkappa_w \|\nu\| \quad \text{for all } \nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

(2) *There exists a positive constant c such that*

$$\sigma(K) \le c\Big(\operatorname{cap}(K)\Big)^q \quad \text{for all compact sets } K \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

(3) $\mathbf{G}\sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) Without loss of generality we may assume that the kernel G is *strictly positive*, that is, $G(x,x) > 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$. Otherwise, we can consider the kernel G on the set $\Omega \setminus A$, where $A := \{x \in \Omega\colon G(x,x) \neq 0\}$, since A is negligible for the corresponding $(1,q)$-inequality in statement (1). (See details in [16] in the case of the corresponding strong-type inequalities.)

We remark that the kernel G is known to be strictly positive if and only if, for any compact set $K \subset \Omega$, the inner capacity $\operatorname{cap}(K)$ is finite ([9]). In this case there exists an equilibrium measure λ on K such that

$$\mathbf{G}\lambda \ge 1 \text{ n.e. on } K, \quad \mathbf{G}\lambda \le 1 \text{ on } S(\lambda), \quad \|\lambda\| = \operatorname{cap}(K). \tag{2.22}$$

Here n.e. stands for *nearly everywhere*, which means that the inequality holds on a given set except for a subset of zero capacity [9].

Next, we remark that condition (1) yields that σ is absolutely continuous with respect to capacity, i.e., $\sigma(K) = 0$ if $\operatorname{cap}(K) = 0$. (See a similar argument in [16] in the case of strong-type inequalities.) Consequently, $\mathbf{G}\lambda \ge 1$ $d\sigma$-a.e. on K. Hence, by applying condition (1) with $\nu = \lambda$, we obtain (2).

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) We denote by σ_E denotes the restriction of σ to a Borel set $E \subset \Omega$. Without loss of generality we may assume that σ is a finite measure on Ω. Otherwise we can replace σ with σ_F where F is a compact subset of Ω. We then deduce the estimate

$$\|\mathbf{G}\sigma_F\|_{L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma_F)} \le C < \infty,$$

where C does not depend on F, and use the exhaustion of Ω by an increasing sequence of compact subsets $F_n \uparrow \Omega$ to conclude that $\mathbf{G}\sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)$ by the Monotone Convergence Theorem.

Set $E_t := \{x \in \Omega\colon\ \mathbf{G}\sigma(x) > t\}$, where $t > 0$. Notice that, for all $x \in (E_t)^c$,

$$\mathbf{G}\sigma_{(E_t)^c}(x) \le \mathbf{G}\sigma(x) \le t.$$

The set $(E_t)^c$ is closed, and hence the preceding inequality holds on $S(\sigma_{(E_t)^c})$. It follows by the weak maximum principle that, for all $x \in \Omega$,

$$\mathbf{G}\sigma_{(E_t)^c}(x) \le \mathbf{G}\sigma(x) \le ht.$$

Hence,

$$\{x \in \Omega\colon \mathbf{G}\sigma(x) > (h+1)t\} \subset \{x \in \Omega\colon \mathbf{G}\sigma_{E_t}(x) > t\}. \tag{2.23}$$

Denote by $K \subset \Omega$ a compact subset of $\{x \in \Omega\colon \mathbf{G}\sigma_{E_t}(x) > t\}$. By (2), we have

$$\sigma(K) \le c\Big(\operatorname{cap}(K)\Big)^q$$

If λ is the equilibrium measure on K, then $\mathbf{G}\lambda \le 1$ on $S(\lambda)$, and $\lambda(K) = \mathrm{cap}(K)$ by (2.22). Hence by the weak maximum principle $\mathbf{G}\lambda \le h$ on Ω. Using quasi-symmetry of the kernel G and Fubini's theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{cap}(K) &= \int_K d\lambda \\ &\le \frac{1}{t}\int_K \mathbf{G}\sigma_{E_t}\, d\lambda \\ &\le \frac{a}{t}\int_{E_t} \mathbf{G}\lambda\, d\sigma \\ &\le \frac{ah}{t}\sigma(E_t).\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\sigma(K) \le \frac{c(ah)^q}{t^q}\Big(\sigma(E_t)\Big)^q.$$

Taking the supremum over all $K \subset E_t$, we deduce

$$\Big(\sigma(E_t)\Big)^{1-q} \le \frac{c(ah)^q}{t^q}.$$

It follows from (2.23) that, for all $t > 0$,

$$t^{\frac{q}{1-q}}\sigma\Big(\Omega\colon\, \mathbf{G}\sigma(x) > (h+1)t\Big) \le t^{\frac{q}{1-q}}\sigma(E_t) \le c^{\frac{1}{1-q}}(ah)^{\frac{q}{1-q}}.$$

Thus, (3) holds.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) By Hölder's inequality for weak L^q spaces, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{G}\nu\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} &= \left\|\frac{\mathbf{G}\nu}{\mathbf{G}\sigma}\mathbf{G}\sigma\right\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \\ &\le \left\|\frac{\mathbf{G}\nu}{\mathbf{G}\sigma}\right\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\sigma)} \|\mathbf{G}\sigma\|_{L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)} \\ &\le C\,\|\mathbf{G}\sigma\|_{L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)}\,\|\nu\|,\end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality,

$$\left\|\frac{\mathbf{G}\nu}{\mathbf{G}\sigma}\right\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\sigma)} \le C\,\|\nu\|,$$

with a constant $C = C(h,a)$, was obtained in [16], for quasi-symmetric kernels G satisfying the weak maximum principle. □

3. Fractional Maximal Operators

We denote by $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ the class of positive locally finite Borel measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$. For $\nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we set $\|\nu\| = \nu(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Let $\nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and let $0 \le \alpha < n$. We define the fractional maximal operator M_α by

$$M_\alpha \nu(x) := \sup_{Q \ni x} \frac{|Q|_\nu}{|Q|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{3.1}$$

where Q is a cube, $|Q|_\nu := \nu(Q)$, and $|Q|$ is the Lebesgue measure of Q. If $f \in L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mu)$ where $\mu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we set $M_\alpha(f d\mu) = M_\alpha \nu$ where $d\nu = |f| d\mu$, i.e.,

$$M_\alpha(f d\mu)(x) := \sup_{Q \ni x} \frac{1}{|Q|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}} \int_Q |f|\, d\mu, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{3.2}$$

For $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, it was shown in [22] that in the case $0 < q < p$,

$$M_\alpha \colon L^p(dx) \to L^q(d\sigma) \Longleftrightarrow M_\alpha \sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{p-q}}(d\sigma), \tag{3.3}$$

$$M_\alpha \colon L^p(dx) \to L^{q,\infty}(d\sigma) \Longleftrightarrow M_\alpha \sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{p-q},\infty}(d\sigma), \tag{3.4}$$

provided $p > 1$.

More general two-weight maximal inequalities

$$\|M_\alpha(f d\mu)\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \le \varkappa \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}, \quad \text{for all } f \in L^p(\mu), \tag{3.5}$$

where characterized by E. T. Sawyer [18] in the case $p = q > 1$, R. L. Wheeden [24] in the case $q > p > 1$, and the second author [22] in the case $0 < q < p$ and $p > 1$, along with their weak-type counterparts,

$$\|M_\alpha(f d\mu)\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \le \varkappa_w \|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}, \quad \text{for all } f \in L^p(\mu), \tag{3.6}$$

where $\sigma, \mu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\varkappa, \varkappa_w$ are positive constants which do not dependent on f.

However, some of the methods used in [22] for $0 < q < p$ and $p > 1$ are not directly applicable in the case $p = 1$, although there are analogues of these results for real Hardy spaces, i.e., when the norm $\|f\|_{L^p(\mu)}$ on the right-hand side of (3.5) or (3.6) is replaced with $\|M_\mu f\|_{L^p(\mu)}$, where

$$M_\mu f(x) := \sup_{Q \ni x} \frac{1}{|Q|_\mu} \int_Q |f| d\mu. \tag{3.7}$$

We would like to understand similar problems in the case $0 < q < 1$ and $p = 1$, in particular, when $M_\alpha \colon \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^q(d\sigma)$, or equivalently, there exists a constant $\varkappa > 0$ such that the inequality

$$\|M_\alpha \nu\|_{L^q(\sigma)} \le \varkappa \|\nu\| \tag{3.8}$$

holds for all $\nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

In the case $\alpha = 0$, Rozin [17] showed that the condition

$$\sigma \in L^{\frac{1}{1-q},1}(\mathbb{R}^n, dx)$$

is sufficient for the Hardy-Littlewood operator $M = M_0 \colon L^1(dx) \to L^q(\sigma)$ to be bounded; moreover, when σ is radially symmetric and decreasing, this is also a necessary condition. We will generalize this result and provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the range $0 \le \alpha < n$. We also obtain analogous results for the weak-type inequality

$$\|M_\alpha \nu\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \le \varkappa_w \|\nu\|, \quad \text{for all } \nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{3.9}$$

where $\varkappa_w$ is a positive constant which does not depend on ν.

We treat more general maximal operators as well, in particular, dyadic maximal operators

$$M_\rho \nu(x) := \sup_{Q\in\mathscr{Q}:\, Q\ni x} \rho_Q\, |Q|_\nu, \tag{3.10}$$

where $\mathscr{Q}$ is the family of all dyadic cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$, and $\{\rho_Q\}_{Q\in\mathscr{Q}}$ is a fixed sequence of nonnegative reals associated with $Q\in\mathscr{Q}$. The corresponding weak-type maximal inequality is given by

$$\|M_\rho \nu\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \le \varkappa_w \|\nu\|, \quad \text{for all } \nu\in\mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n). \tag{3.11}$$

3.1. **Strong-Type Inequality.**

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\sigma\in M^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $0<q<1$, and $0\le\alpha<n$. The inequality (3.8) holds if and only if there exists a function $u\not\equiv 0$ such that*

$$u\in L^q(\sigma), \quad \text{and} \quad u\ge M_\alpha(u^q\sigma).$$

Moreover, u can be constructed as follows: $u=\lim_{j\to\infty} u_j$, where $u_0 := (M_\alpha\sigma)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$, $u_{j+1}\ge u_j$, and

$$u_{j+1} := M_\alpha(u_j^q\sigma), \quad j=0,1,\dots. \tag{3.12}$$

In particular, $u\ge (M_\alpha\sigma)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$.

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) We let $u_0 := (M_\alpha\sigma)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$. Notice that, for all $x\in Q$, we have $u_0(x)\ge \Big(\frac{|Q|_\sigma}{|Q|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$. Hence,

$$u_1(x) := M_\alpha(u_0^q d\sigma)(x) = \sup_{Q\ni x}\frac{1}{|Q|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}}\int_Q u_0^q d\sigma \ge \sup_{Q\ni x}\Big(\frac{|Q|_\sigma}{|Q|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}}\Big)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} = u_0(x).$$

By induction, we see that

$$u_{j+1} := M_\alpha(u_j^q d\sigma) \ge M_\alpha(u_{j-1}^q d\sigma) = u_j, \quad j=1,2,\dots.$$

Let $u=\lim u_j$. By (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{j+1}\|_{L^q(\sigma)} &= \|M_\alpha(u_j^q\sigma)\|_{L^q(\sigma)}\\ &\le \varkappa\|u_j\|^q_{L^q(\sigma)}\\ &\le \varkappa\|u_{j+1}\|^q_{L^q(\sigma)}.\end{aligned}$$

From this we deduce that $\|u_{j+1}\|^q_{L^q(\sigma)}\le \varkappa^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$ for $j=0,1,\dots$. Since the norms $\|u_j\|^q_{L^q(\sigma)}$ are uniformly bounded, by the Monotone Convergence Theorem, we have for $u:=\lim_{j\to\infty}u_j$ that $u\in L^q(\sigma)$. Note that by construction $u=M_\alpha(u^q d\sigma)$.

($\Leftarrow$) We can assume here that $M_\alpha\nu$ is defined, for $\nu\in\mathscr{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, as the centered fractional maximal function,

$$M_\alpha\nu(x) := \sup_{r>0}\frac{\nu(B(x,r))}{|B(x,r)|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}},$$

since it is equivalent to its uncentered analogue used above. Suppose that there exists $u\in L^q(\sigma)$ ($u\not\equiv 0$) such that $u\ge M_\alpha(u^q d\sigma)$. Set $\omega := u^q d\sigma$. Let $\nu\in\mathscr{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

We note that we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{M_\alpha \nu(x)}{M_\alpha \omega(x)} &= \frac{\sup_{r>0} \frac{|B(x,r)|_\nu}{|B(x,r)|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}}}{\sup_{\rho>0} \frac{|B(x,\rho)|_\nu}{|B(x,\rho)|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}}} \\ &\le \sup_{r>0} \frac{|B(x,r)|_\nu}{|B(x,r)|_\omega} \\ &=: M_\omega \nu(x).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\|M_\alpha \nu\|_{L^q(\sigma)} &= \left\| \frac{M_\alpha \nu}{M_\alpha \omega} \right\|_{L^q((M_\alpha \omega)^q d\sigma)} \\ &\le \left\| \frac{M_\alpha \nu}{M_\alpha \omega} \right\|_{L^q(d\omega)} \\ &\le \|M_\omega \nu\|_{L^q(d\omega)} \\ &\le C \|M_\omega \nu\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\omega)} \le C\|\nu\|,\end{aligned}$$

by Jensen's inequality and the $(1,1)$-weak-type maximal function inequality for $M_\sigma \nu$. This establishes (3.8). □

3.2. **Weak-Type Inequality.** For $0 \le \alpha < n$, we define the *Hausdorff content* on a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ to be

$$H^{n-\alpha}(E) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i^{n-\alpha} : E \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} B(x_i, r_i), \right\} \tag{3.13}$$

where the collection of balls $\{B(x_i, r_i)\}$ forms a countable covering of E.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\sigma \in M^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $0 < q < 1$, and $0 \le \alpha < n$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *There exists a positive constant $\varkappa_w$ such that*

$$\|M_\alpha \nu\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \le \varkappa_w \|\nu\| \quad \text{for all } \nu \in \mathscr{M}(\mathbb{R}^n).$$

(2) *There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\sigma(E) \le C\,(H^{n-\alpha}(E))^q \quad \text{for all Borel sets } E \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

(3) $M_\alpha \sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)$.

Remark 3.3. *In the case $\alpha = 0$ each of the conditions* (1)–(3) *is equivalent to $\sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(dx)$.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) Let $K \subset E$ be a compact set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $H^{n-\alpha}(K) > 0$. It follows from Frostman's theorem (see the proof of Theorem 5.1.12 in [1]) that there exists a measure ν supported on K such that $\nu(K) \le H^{n-\alpha}(K)$, and, for every

$x \in K$ there exists a cube Q such that $x \in Q$ and $|Q|_\nu \geq c\,|Q|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}$, where c depends only on n and α. Hence,

$$M_\alpha \nu(x) \geq \sup_{Q \ni x} \frac{|Q|_\nu}{|Q|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}} \geq c \quad \text{for all } x \in K,$$

where c depends only on n and α. Consequently,

$$c^q\, \sigma(K) \leq \|M_\alpha \nu\|^q_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \leq \varkappa_w^q \Big(H^{n-\alpha}(K)\Big)^q.$$

If $H^{n-\alpha}(E) = 0$, then $H^{n-\alpha}(K) = 0$ for every compact set $K \subset E$, and consequently $\sigma(E) = 0$. Otherwise,

$$\sigma(K) \leq \varkappa_w^q \Big(H^{n-\alpha}(K)\Big)^q \leq \varkappa_w^q \Big(H^{n-\alpha}(K)\Big)^q,$$

for every compact set $K \subset E$, which proves (2) with $C = c^{-q} \varkappa_w^q$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) Let $E_t := \{x : M_\alpha \sigma(x) > t\}$, where $t > 0$. Let $K \subset E_t$ be a compact set. Then for each $x \in K$ there exists $Q_x \ni x$ such that

$$\frac{\sigma(Q_x)}{|Q_x|^{1-(\frac{\alpha}{n})}} > t.$$

Now consider the collection $\{Q_x\}_{x \in K}$, which forms a cover of K. By the Besicovitch covering lemma, we can find a subcover $\{Q_i\}_{i \in I}$, where I is a countable index set, such that $K \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} Q_i$ and $x \in K$ is contained in at most b_n sets in $\{Q_i\}$. By (2), we have

$$\sigma(K) \leq [H^{n-\alpha}(K)]^q,$$

and by the definition of the Hausdorff content we have

$$H^{n-\alpha}(K) \leq \sum |Q_i|^{1-(\alpha/n)}.$$

Since $\{Q_i\}$ have bounded overlap, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I} \sigma(Q_i) \leq b_n \sigma(K).$$

Thus,

$$\sigma(K) \leq \left(b_n \frac{\sigma(K)}{t}\right)^q,$$

which shows that

$$t^{\frac{q}{1-q}} \sigma(K) \leq (b_n)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} < +\infty.$$

Taking the supremum over all $K \subset E_t$ in the preceding inequality, we deduce $M_\alpha \sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)$.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1). We can assume again that M_α is the centered fractional maximal function, since it is equivalent to the uncentered version. Suppose that $M_\alpha \sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)$. Let $\nu \in \mathscr{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Then, as in the case of the strong-type inequality,

$$\frac{M_\alpha \nu(x)}{M_\alpha \sigma(x)} = \frac{\sup_{r>0} \frac{|B(x,r)|_\nu}{|B(x,r)|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}}}{\sup_{\rho>0} \frac{|B(x,\rho)|_\sigma}{|B(x,\rho)|^{1-\frac{\alpha}{n}}}}$$

$$\leq \sup_{r>0} \frac{|B(x,r)|_\nu}{|B(x,r)|_\sigma} =: M_\sigma \nu(x).$$

Thus, by Hölder's inequality for weak L^p-spaces,

$$\begin{aligned}\|M_\alpha \nu\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} &\leq \|(M_\alpha \sigma)\,(M_\sigma \nu)\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \\ &\leq \|M_\alpha \sigma\|_{L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)}\, \|M_\sigma \nu\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\sigma)} \\ &\leq c\|M_\alpha \sigma\|_{L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)}\, \|\nu\|,\end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we have used the $(1,1)$-weak-type maximal function inequality for the centered maximal function $M_\sigma \nu$. □

We now characterize weak-type $(1,q)$-inequalities (3.11) for the generalized dyadic maximal operator M_ρ defined by (3.10). The corresponding (p,q)-inequalities in the case $0<q<p$ and $p>1$ were characterized in [22]. The results obtained in [22] for weak-type inequalities remain valid in the case $p=1$, but some elements of the proofs must be modified as indicated below.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $0<q<1$, and $0 \leq \alpha < n$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *There exists a positive constant $\varkappa_w$ such that* (3.11) *holds.*

(2) $M_\rho \sigma \in L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)$.

Proof. (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) The proof of this implication is similar to the case of fractional maximal operators. Let $\nu \in \mathscr{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Denoting by $Q, P \in \mathscr{Q}$ dyadic cubes in $\mathbb{R}^n$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{M_\rho \nu(x)}{M_\rho \sigma(x)} &= \frac{\sup_{Q \ni x}(\rho_Q\, |Q|_\nu)}{\sup_{P \ni x}(\rho_P\, |P|_\sigma)} \\ &\leq \sup_{Q \ni x} \frac{|Q|_\nu}{|Q|_\sigma} =: M_\sigma \nu(x).\end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality for weak L^p-spaces,

$$\begin{aligned}\|M_\rho \nu\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} &\leq \|(M_\rho \sigma)\,(M_\sigma \nu)\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \\ &\leq \|M_\rho \sigma\|_{L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)}\, \|M_\sigma \nu\|_{L^{1,\infty}(\sigma)} \\ &\leq c\|M_\rho \sigma\|_{L^{\frac{q}{1-q},\infty}(\sigma)}\, \|\nu\|,\end{aligned}$$

by the $(1,1)$-weak-type maximal function inequality for the dyadic maximal function M_σ.

(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) We set $f = \sup_Q(\lambda_Q \chi_Q)$ and $d\nu = f\, d\sigma$, where $\{\lambda_Q\}_{Q \in \mathscr{Q}}$ is a finite sequence of non-negative reals. Then obviously

$$M_\rho \nu(x) \geq \sup_Q(\lambda_Q \rho_Q \chi_Q), \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nu\| \leq \sum_Q \lambda_Q\, |Q|_\sigma.$$

By (1), for all $\{\lambda_Q\}_{Q \in \mathscr{Q}}$,

$$\|\sup_Q(\lambda_Q \rho_Q \chi_Q)\|_{L^{q,\infty}(\sigma)} \leq \varkappa_\nu \sum_Q \lambda_Q\, |Q|_\sigma.$$

Hence, by Theorem 1.1 and Remark 1.2 in [22], it follows that (2) holds.

□

4. Carleson Measures for Poisson Integrals

In this section we treat $(1,q)$-Carleson measure inequalities for Poisson integrals with respect to Carleson measures $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$ in the upper half-space $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+ = (x,y)\colon x \in \mathbb{R}^n, y > 0$. The corresponding weak-type (p,q)-inequalities for all $0 < q < p$ as well as strong-type (p,q)-inequalities for $0 < q < p$ and $p > 1$, were characterized in [23]. Here we consider strong-type inequalities of the type

$$\|\mathbf{P}\nu\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\sigma)} \le \varkappa \|\nu\|_{\mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)}, \quad \text{for all } \nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n), \tag{4.1}$$

for some constant $\varkappa > 0$, where $\mathbf{P}\nu$ is the Poisson integral of $\nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$ defined by

$$\mathbf{P}\nu(x,y) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} P(x-t,y)\,d\nu(t), \quad (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+.$$

Here $P(x,y)$ denotes the Poisson kernel associated with $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$.

By $\mathbf{P}^*\mu$ we denote the formal adjoint (balayage) operator defined, for $\mu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$, by

$$\mathbf{P}^*\mu(t) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} P(x-t,y)\,d\mu(x,y), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We will also need the symmetrized potential defined, for $\mu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$, by

$$\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*\mu(x,y) := \mathbf{P}\Big[(\mathbf{P}^*\mu)dt\Big] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} P(x-\tilde{x},y+\tilde{y})\,d\mu(\tilde{x},\tilde{y}), \quad (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+.$$

As we will demonstrate below, the kernel of $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*\mu$ satisfies the weak maximum principle with constant $h = 2^{n+1}$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\sigma \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$, and let $0 < q < 1$. Then inequality (4.1) holds if and only if there exists a function $u > 0$ such that*

$$u \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\sigma), \quad \text{and} \quad u \ge \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(u^q\sigma) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+.$$

Moreover, if (4.1) holds, then a positive solution $u = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(u^q\sigma)$ such that $u \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\sigma)$ can be constructed as follows: $u = \lim_{j\to\infty} u_j$, where

$$u_{j+1} := \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(u_j^q\sigma), \quad j = 0,1,\dots, \quad u_0 := c_0(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*\sigma)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}, \tag{4.2}$$

for a small enough constant $c_0 > 0$ (depending only on q and n), which ensures that $u_{j+1} \ge u_j$. In particular, $u \ge c_0\,(\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*\sigma)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$.

Proof. We first prove that (4.1) holds if and only if

$$\|\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*\mu\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\sigma)} \le \varkappa \|\mu\|_{\mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)}, \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+). \tag{4.3}$$

Indeed, letting $\nu = \mathbf{P}^*\mu$ in (4.1) yields (4.3) with the same embedding constant $\varkappa$.

Conversely, suppose that (4.3) holds. Then by Maurey's factorization theorem (see [14]), there exists $F \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \sigma)$ such that $F > 0$ $d\sigma$-a.e., and

$$\|F\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\sigma)} \le 1, \qquad \sup_{(x,y)\in\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+} \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(F^{1-\frac{1}{q}}d\sigma)(x,y) \le \varkappa. \tag{4.4}$$

By letting $y \downarrow 0$ in (4.4) and using the Monotone Convergence Theorem, we deduce

$$\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbf{P}^*(F^{1-\frac{1}{q}}d\sigma)(x) \le \varkappa. \tag{4.5}$$

Hence, by Jensen's inequality and (4.5), for any $\nu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we have

$$\|\mathbf{P}\nu\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\sigma)} \le \|\mathbf{P}\nu\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,F^{1-\frac{1}{q}}d\sigma)} = \|\mathbf{P}^*(F^{1-\frac{1}{q}}d\sigma)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n,d\nu)} \le \varkappa\|\nu\|_{\mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

We next show that the kernel of $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*$ satisfies the weak maximum principle with constant $h = 2^{n+1}$. Indeed, suppose $\mu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+)$, and

$$\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*\mu(\tilde{x},\tilde{y}) \le M, \quad \text{for all } (\tilde{x},\tilde{y}) \in S(\mu).$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $S(\mu) \Subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ is a compact set. For $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $(x_0,y_0) \in S(\mu)$ be a point such that

$$|(t,0)-(x_0,y_0)| = \operatorname{dist}\Big((t,0),S(\mu)\Big).$$

Then by the triangle inequality, for any $(\tilde{x},\tilde{y}) \in S(\mu)$,

$$|(x_0,y_0)-(\tilde{x},-\tilde{y})| \le |(x_0,y_0)-(t,0)| + |(t,0)-(\tilde{x},-\tilde{y})| \le 2|(t,0)-(\tilde{x},\tilde{y})|.$$

Hence,

$$\sqrt{|t-\tilde{x}|^2+\tilde{y}^2} \ge \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\Big[|x_0-\tilde{x}|^2+(y_0+\tilde{y})^2\Big]}.$$

It follows that, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $(\tilde{x},\tilde{y}) \in S(\mu)$, we have

$$P(t-\tilde{x},\tilde{y}) \le 2^{n+1}P(x_0-\tilde{x},y_0+\tilde{y}).$$

Consequently, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathbf{P}^*\mu(t) \le 2^{n+1}\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*\mu(x_0,y_0) \le 2^{n+1}M.$$

Applying the Poisson integral $\mathbf{P}[dt]$ to both sides of the preceding inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*\mu(x,y) \le 2^{n+1}M \quad \text{for all } (x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+.$$

This proves that the weak maximum principle holds for $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*$ with $h = 2^{n+1}$. It follows from Theorem 2.3 that (4.1) holds if and only if there exists a non-trivial $u \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\sigma)$ such that $u \ge \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(u^q d\sigma)$. Moreover, a positive solution $u = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(u^q\sigma)$ can be constructed as in the statement of Theorem 4.1 (see details in [16]). □

Corollary 4.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, inequality (4.1) holds if and only if there exists a function $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\phi > 0$ a.e., such that*

$$\phi \ge \mathbf{P}^*\Big[(\mathbf{P}\phi)^q d\sigma\Big] \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Moreover, if (4.1) holds, then there exists a positive solution $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to the equation $\phi = \mathbf{P}^*\Big[(\mathbf{P}\phi)^q d\sigma\Big]$.

Proof. If (4.1) holds then by Theorem 4.1 there exists $u = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(u^q d\sigma)$ such that $u > 0$ and $u \in L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+, \sigma)$. Setting $\phi = \mathbf{P}^*(u^q d\sigma)$, we see that

$$\mathbf{P}\phi = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(u^q d\sigma) = u,$$

so that $\phi = \mathbf{P}^*[(\mathbf{P}\phi)^q d\sigma]$, and consequently

$$\|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|u\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\sigma)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(x,y)dx < \infty.$$

Conversely, if there exists $\phi > 0$, $\phi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ such that $\phi \geq \mathbf{P}^*\Big[(\mathbf{P}\phi)^q d\sigma\Big]$, then letting $u = \mathbf{P}\phi$, we see that u is a positive harmonic function in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+$ so that

$$u = \mathbf{P}\phi \geq \mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(u^q d\sigma),$$

and for all $y > 0$,

$$\|u\|^q_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}_+,\sigma)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \Big[\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^*(u^q d\sigma)\Big](x,y)\,dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} u(x,y)dx = \|\phi\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} < \infty.$$

Hence, inequality (4.1) holds by Theorem 4.1. □

REFERENCES

[1] D. R. ADAMS AND L. I. HEDBERG, Function Spaces and Potential Theory, Grundlehren der math. Wissenschaften **314**, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, Springer, 1996.

[2] A. ANCONA, First eigenvalues and comparison of Green's functions for elliptic operators on manifolds or domains, *J. Anal. Math.* **72** (1997), 45–92.

[3] A. ANCONA, Some results and examples about the behavior of harmonic functions and Green's functions with respect to second order elliptic operators, *Nagoya Math. J.* **165** (2002), 123–158.

[4] H. BREZIS AND S. KAMIN, Sublinear elliptic equation on $\mathbb{R}^n$, *Manuscr. Math.* **74** (1992), 87–106.

[5] H. BREZIS AND L. OSWALD, Remarks on sublinear elliptic equations, *Nonlin. Analysis: Theory, Methods, Appl.* **10** (1986), 55–64.

[6] DAT T. CAO AND I. E. VERBITSKY, Finite energy solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations with sub-natural growth terms, *Calc. Var. PDE* **52** (2015), 529–546.

[7] DAT T. CAO AND I. E. VERBITSKY, Nonlinear elliptic equations and intrinsic potentials of Wolff type, arXiv:1409.4076.

[8] DAT T. CAO AND I. E. VERBITSKY, Pointwise estimates of Brezis–Kamin type for solutions of sublinear elliptic equations, arXiv:1601.05496.

[9] B. FUGLEDE, On the theory of potentials in locally compact spaces, *Acta Math.* **103** (1960), 139–215.

[10] E. GAGLIARDO, On integral transformations with positive kernel, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **16** (1965), 429–434.

[11] A. GRIGOR'YAN AND I. E. VERBITSKY, Pointwise estimates of solutions to semilinear elliptic equations and inequalities, *J. d'Analyse Math.* (to appear) arXiv:1511.03188.

[12] N. S. LANDKOF, Foundations of Modern Potential Theory, Grundlehren der math. Wissenschaften, **180**, Springer-Verlag, New York–Heidelberg, 1972.

[13] M. MARCUS AND L. VÉRON, Nonlinear Second Order Elliptic Equations Involving Measures, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin–Boston, 2014.

[14] B. MAUREY, Théorèmes de factorisation pour les opérateurs linéaires à valeurs dans un espaces L^p, *Astérisque* **11** (1974), Soc. Math. France.
[15] V. MAZ'YA, Sobolev Spaces, with Applications to Elliptic Partial Differential Equations, 2nd, Augmented Edition. Grundlehren der math. Wissenschaften **342**, Springer, Berlin, 2011.
[16] S. QUINN AND I. E. VERBITSKY, A sublinear version of Schur's lemma and elliptic PDE, *preprint* (2016).
[17] A. L. ROZIN, Singular integrals and maximal functions in the space L^1, *Bull. Georgian Acad. Sci.* **87** (1977), 29–32 (in Russian).
[18] E. T. SAWYER, A characterization of a two-weight norm inequality for maximal operators, *Studia Math.* **75** (1982), 1–11.
[19] G. SINNAMON, Schur's lemma and best constants in weighted norm inequalities, *Le Matematiche* **57** (2005), 165–204.
[20] G. SINNAMON AND V. D. STEPANOV, The weighted Hardy inequality: new proofs and the case $p = 1$, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **54** (1996), 89–101.
[21] P. SZEPTYCKI, Notes on Integral Transformations, *Dissert. Math.* **231** (1984), 1–52.
[22] I. E. VERBITSKY, Weighted norm inequalities for maximal operators and Pisier's theorem on factorization through $L^{p,\infty}$, *Int. Eqns. Oper. Theory* **15** (1992), 121–153.
[23] I. V. VIDENSKII, On an analogue of Carleson measures, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **37** (1988), 186–190.
[24] R. L. WHEEDEN, A characterization of some weighted norm inequalities for the fractional maximal function, *Studia Math.* **107** (1993), 258–272.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA, MO 65211
E-mail address: stephen.quinn@mail.missouri.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA, MO 65211
E-mail address: verbitskyi@missouri.edu